

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through 10/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		MS1 0789US	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AP, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on <u>8/18/05</u> Signature <u>Rachel M</u> Typed or printed name <u>Rachel Murphy</u>		Application Number	Filed
		09/882,810	6/14/2001
		First Named Inventor	
		Shannon J. Chan	
		Art Unit	Examiner
		2131	Taghi T Arani
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the			
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.		Signature <u>Daniel L Hayes</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/86)		Daniel L. Hayes	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. 34618		509-324-9256	
Registration number		Telephone number	
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.		8/18/05	
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34		Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
<input type="checkbox"/> *Total of _____ forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to be (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AP, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

AUG 18 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.....09/882,810
Filing Date.....6/14/2001
Confirmation No.7986
Inventorship.....Chan et al.
Applicant.....Microsoft Corporation
Group Art Unit.....2131
ExaminerArani, Taghi T
Attorney's Docket No.MS1-789US
Title: Key Exchange Mechanism for Streaming Protected Media Content

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF

Independent claims 1, 13, 19, 24, and 27 have been rejected as being anticipated under §102 by the Spies reference. The Examiner's error in making this rejection is plainly illustrated by the following two paragraphs, taken from page 2 of the 5/31/05 Office Action:

As per independent claims 1, 13, 19, 24, and 27, the Applicant merely argues that the cited prior art of Spies does not describe exchanging keys between a DVD drive and any other component and that it does not disclose passing one or more keys from a DVD. The Applicant admits (page 12 of the REMARKS) of Spies discussing various types of keys and communication of keys between different components, including servers and clients, but argues that Spies does not disclose passing keys from DVDs (page 9 of the REMARKS).

The Examiner responds that independent claims 1, 13, 19, 24, and 27 are rejected based on U.S.C. 102(b) and the functional elements of exchanging keys were found to be substantially anticipated by Spices, where the program key is exchanged between purchaser and merchant units using pair of public and private exchange keys (col. 3, lines 19-51, see also col. 11, lines 46+) to obtain decryption capabilities.

A §102 rejection requires that each and every element of a claim be present in a single reference, arranged as claimed. Claim 1, as an example, recites that a client and server "pass one or more keys *from the DVD* to the key exchange client

1 "... Spies does not show this, as the Examiner impliedly admits in the passage
2 above.

3 In response to the argument that Spies does not show passing keys from
4 DVDs, the Examiner has maintained that even so, Spies "substantially" anticipates
5 the claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that this does not meet the
6 requirements of §102. Spies does not show all the elements of the independent
7 claims, and therefore does not anticipate the claims.

8 Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore requested.

9
10 Respectfully Submitted,

11
12 Dated: 8/18/05

By: 

Daniel L. Hayes
Reg. No. 34,618
(509) 324-9256